

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-5, 9-12, 16-20 and 24-27 are pending in the present application. No claims were canceled; claims 1, 2, and 16 were amended; and no claims were added. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

### **I. Obvious-Type Double Patenting (Claims 1-5, 9-12, 16-20 and 24-27)**

Claims 1-5, 9-12, 16-20 and 24-27 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 and 30-45 of copending Application No. 10/617,526 (hereinafter the ‘526 application) in view of Chinese-English Dictionary,

<http://web.archive.org/web/20000301054545/http://www.mandarintools.com/worddict.html>

(hereinafter “Chinese-English Dictionary”) and in further view of Chinese-English Lookup,

<http://web.archive.org/web/20010309104519/http://home.iprimus.com.au/richwarm/cel/cel.htm>

(hereinafter “Lookup”). Office Action dated October 28, 2008, pp. 4-7. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 16-20 and 24-27 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 and 9-12 of the ‘526 application in view of Chinese-English Dictionary, and in further view of Lookup. Office Action dated October 28, 2008, p. 7. Each independent claim has been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments traverse this rejection.

### **II. Obvious-Type Double Patenting (Claims 1-3, 9-10, 16-18 and 24-25)**

Claims 1-3, 9-10, 16-18 and 24-25 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5-6, 26 and 30-31 of copending Application No. 10/631,070 (hereinafter the ‘070 application) in view of Chinese-English Dictionary, and in further view of Lookup. Office action dated October 28, 2008, pp. 8-11. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 16-18 and 24-25 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 and 9-10 of the ‘070 application in view of Chinese-English Dictionary, and in further view of Lookup. Office action dated October 28,

2008, p. 11. Each independent claim has been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments traverse this rejection.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

### **III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness (Claims 1-4, 9-11, 16-19 and 24-26)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 9-11, 16-19 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Chinese-English Dictionary in view of Lookup. Office Action dated October 28, 2008, pp. 11-15. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 16 to further distinguish over the cited art. Independent claims 1 and 16 now specifically recite the graphical user interface depicted in FIG. 4 of the application, and specifically claim that the simultaneous display of equivalent characters takes place automatically in response only to (1) insertion of a character into a single field, and (2) activation of a submit control. The language of the claims precludes any other user actions or the use of any other graphical user interface. Therefore, both the particular display and the automatic side-by-side display in response to only two actions distinguish over the art of record. For example, the prior art takes at least several more steps to achieve the result of claims 1 and 16. Support for the amendments is found in FIG. 4 and in the specification, page 9 line 19 to page 11, line 6.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-4, 9-11, 16-19 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

### **IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness (Claims 5, 12, 20 and 27)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 5, 12, 20 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Chinese-English Dictionary in view of Lookup, and further in view of Hughes, “1ICT3 Computer Science Sample Paper I”, 1998, University of Dublin (hereinafter “Hughes”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Office Action dated October 28, 2008, pp. 15-16.

Claims 5 and 12 depend from claim 1, and are allowable for the reasons set forth above in regard to claim 1. Claims 20 and 27 depend from claim 16 and are allowable for the reasons set forth above in regard to claim 16.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 5, 12, 20 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

**V. Objection to Claims**

The Examiner has stated that claim 2 was objected to because of an informality. In response, the claim has been rewritten to overcome this objection.

**VI. Conclusion**

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: January 29, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Rudolf O. Siegesmund/

Rudolf O. Siegesmund  
Reg. No. 37,720  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorney for Applicants